

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested based upon the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Lin and Supervisory Examiner Vanderpuye in the September 12, 2007 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-11, 13-18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0181853 to Ido et al. ("Ido '853"). A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102 requires every element of the claim to be included in the reference, either directly or inherently. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is traversed by the following argument.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an optical transceiver comprising a "photoelectric transducer implemented on a substrate." (Emphasis added). Claim 1 further recites wherein the photoelectric transducer implemented on the substrate further comprises "a first dummy ground line located adjacent to and spaced from the high-speed signal line for the light transmitting device, and a second dummy ground line located adjacent to and spaced from the high-speed signal line for the light receiving device."

Applicants respectfully submit that the dummy ground lines are disposed on the substrate and are arranged specifically so as to reduce crosstalk. As recited in claim 1:

"the space between the high-speed signal line for the light transmitting device and the first dummy ground line is less than or equal to the space between the high-speed signal line for the light transmitting device and the bias line for the light transmitting device; and the space between the high-speed signal line for the light receiving device and the second dummy ground line is less than or equal to the space between the high-speed signal line for the light receiving device and the bias line for the light receiving device."

The Office Action asserts that Ido '853, in Figs. 2 and 9, and in paragraphs [0049] and [0079], discloses wherein first and second dummy ground lines 6-3 and 6-4 are arranged as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As argued before the Examiner during the personal interview, Ido '853, in Figs. 2 and 9 and at paragraphs [0049] and [0079], appears to only disclose first and second ground lines located on electrode pattern 3-0, not on substrate 8, as recited in claim 1. Indeed, nowhere does Ido '853 disclose, teach, or suggest dummy ground lines, in any configuration, on substrate 8.

Applicants respectfully submit therefore that the optical transceiver recited in claim 1 is distinguished from the applied art because Ido '853 fails to disclose dummy ground lines disposed on the substrate arranged in a particular pattern as recited in claim 1. Indeed, Ido '853 fails to disclose any dummy ground lines disposed on the substrate.

Accordingly, because Ido '853 does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation recited in claim 1, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is improper.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ido '853 in view of one or more of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0071641 to Nakanishi et al. ("Nakanishi"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0194192 to Ido et al. ("Ido '192"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0027230 to Terada et al. ("Terada") is likewise traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nakanishi, Ido '192, and Terada fail to remedy the deficiencies of Ido. Specifically, nowhere do Nakanishi, Ido '192, and Terada disclose a photoelectric transducer implemented on a substrate, wherein the photoelectric transducer further comprises dummy ground lines disposed on the substrate, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-6 and 8-20 depend from independent claim 1 and are likewise patentable over the applied art at least for their dependence on claim 1, as well as for additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejections under 102(b) and 103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-20 are earnestly solicited.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/  
Yoon S. Ham  
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429  
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: September 17, 2007  
YSH/ERM